staffers, many of whom are former addicts, who have experienced first-hand the torment and personal struggle that is necessary for drug addicts to become "productive" members of a society that quite often doesn't care whether they live or die.

Executive Director James Allen, 51, himself a former drug addict of ten years, presently attends John Jay College where he is studying for a B.A. degree in sociology. He is a lean bespeckled gentleman with a partially bald head and a neatly-trimmed grey beard. After "de-toxing" in a federal facility in Lexington, Kentucky in 1957, he came to New York and has since spent his life "alternating between a drug program, trying to be a husband and going to school." But most of his time is devoted to the drug program.

He believes that psychology and sociology should be applied to solving "contemporary problems. Most blacks who study sociology get brainwashed into accepting things as they are. They get stuck with a lot of theories and hypotheses. But I'm not going to give up because I've already proven that I am successful (drug-free), even after they told me it couldn't be done."

On the second floor of the 5-story ARC building, Allen has 12 large fish tanks filled with tropical fish. Ms. Jackson says that he studies the behavior of the fish to draw sociological conclusions about the behavior of people. For example, once he had two "red devils" in the same tank, but the male refused to allow the female to come out from under a rock to eat. Eventually, she grew desperate for food and came out. The male fish killed her. He was so ferocious that when put in a tank with the less-than-timid "oscars" he often attacked them. To Mr. Allen, the red devils aggression is not unlike that of certain aspects of human aggression.

The enthusiam and dedication of Director Allen is reflected in the attitude of the ARC staff from clerks to administrators who all seem to go about the work of the drug program in a warmly professional fashion.

The "program" actually has two major components—a 24 hour residential drug-free program and a "day-care" one for addicts who continue to live at home—operating out of the Park Avenue building in the Cannan Baptist Church. At Cannan, the "Crisis Intervention Center" (CIC) serves as an intake facility for all addicts coming into the program. ARC offers job and educational counseling, psychological testing and referral to other agencies when necessary.

Residents are recruited by ARC staff from hospitals, street corners and by word-of-mouth or referred by the court or other agencies. However, admittance to the program is strictly on a volunteer basis. "A person must give up two things—drugs and welfare—or they cannot come here," says Allen.

"We try to prevent dependency in our program," he continues. "After you've been in this business a long time, you have to try to avoid functioning just to keep the institution alive."

Consequently, the average stay at ARC is short—from six to nine months; in other drug programs, the length of stay is from twelve to eighteen months.

Allen points out that his program is the only one in North Manhattan (above 110th) that is "graduating" residents. Referring to an Addiction Services Agency bi-weekly report, (2/23/76–3/7/76). Allen notes that "57 people were admitted in all Manhattan North programs; 28 or more than half of those were admitted to ARC. There were fourteen people who graduated; all of them were ARC graduates. Also, there are 465 active clients in Manhattan North; 283 are ARC clients. This means that while ARC has a capacity of 108, it actually provides services for 283. While these figures only cover a single period, they are consistent for the entire year."

Despite the fact that ARC provides services to more addicts that it is contracted to handle, the 1975–76 budget for all facilities which was $1,079,000 (a $600,000 federal grant plus $479,000 for the 128th Street facility) was reduced by $106,000 leaving ARC with an operating budget of $973,000 and the possibility of more cuts when the new fiscal year begins on July 1.

This has also meant the loss of at least 10 of ARC's 67-member staff and it is likely that eventually more staffers will be laid off.

While Allen recognizes the severity of the city's budget crisis, he also is acutely aware of the epidemic proportions of the drug problem in Harlem. Assistant Director Richard Feinster approximates the number of addicts in the city at somewhere near 75,000. "Half of the addicts in treatment are in Central Harlem," says Feinster. A year ago there were a minimum of 15 'drug-free' programs in that same area, now there are only three—ARC, Exodus House and Harlem Confrontation."

"Which would be cheaper?" Allen asks. "To give us the money to run the program and to help addicts get jobs and pay taxes and earn $1,390,500 as they did during the 1975–76 program or turn them into the streets where they earn nothing and end up stealing.

"We have the lowest cost per patient in any of the city's drug programs—$1,000—much lower than the cost of maintaining a man in jail which is close to $30,000 annually".

Mr. Allen's fight, he maintains is not only with shrinking budgets but with also trying to educate the "good" people of Harlem that the fight to combat drug addiction is everyone's problem. "There are a lot of older people who say 'I'm not addicted, so I'm alright' but they should ask themselves if so many young are being killed by drugs who will follow them. We can't afford the luxury of saying that any Black person should die because we can't afford to lose even one."

Ms. Jackson, a petite but energetic young woman echoes the sentiment of Allen in her fervent desire to see the program continue. "Some people try to make re-habilitation a money-making thing and that's sick. Not only ARC, but the whole community needs to be saved. What will we do if Sydenham closes or the community colleges close or other organizations like the Fortune Society are forced to close?"

For Ms. Jackson, the horrors of drug addiction have touched close to home. When remembering a nephew who nearly died from a drug overdose, she says quietly. "It might not have meant anything to the world, if he died, but it meant something to me."

All the staff agrees that cutbacks in service will be the last resort for ARC, which last year serviced 3,822 participants (914 residential participants, 1,151 out-of-residence participants in the "day care" program and 1,754 active addicts, detoxified former addicts and individuals with serious drug and non-drug related problems who were provided service on a short-term basis.

The residents of the Park Avenue building are for the most part, Black, male and young—22 being the median age. Of the center's 360 residents 17 percent are female. Allen points out that "women are less likely to come into the program because money to support their drug habit is more readily available. Secondly, women are more reluctant to leave their children in the care of a social service agency for fear that they will have trouble getting the children back." Allen thinks the fear is not entirely unjustified.

He believes that "we need much more research to determine why women don't come into drug programs in larger numbers and perhaps then we can begin to recruit more women."

Allen vows that he will continue to provide services to Harlem drug addicts because the need is so great. "I take cast out parts, put them together and make people—that's why I'm trying to survive."

HEARINGS ON H.R. 12039, NOTIFICATION BILL

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the Government Information and Individual Rights Subcommittee, which I chair, is holding hearings on H.R. 12039, H.R. 169, and H.R. 13192. These bills would amend the Privacy Act of 1974 to require that the subjects of such illegal activities as the FBI's COINTELPRO, the CIA's CHAOS program, CIA and FBI mail openings and burglaries, and the IRS special service staff, be notified that they were subjects, informed of their rights under the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act, and afforded the option of having the improperly compiled files destroyed.

Our first hearing on this legislation was held on April 28, with CIA Director George Bush and representatives of the Justice Department appearing as witnesses. The second hearing will take place on Tuesday, May 11, at a time and place to be announced. At that time, we expect to hear from IRS Commissioner Donald Alexander and witnesses from the Department of Defense.

My opening statement at the April 28 hearing follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BELLA S. ABZUG

The Subcommittee today begins consideration of an extremely timely and important subject—the rights of individuals who were subjected to surveillance and harassment by programs such as the FBI's COINTELPRO and the CIA's CHAOS. We have before us H.R. 169 and H.R. 12039, which would require that all who were objects or subjects of such programs be provided with notice that the government maintains files on them and that they have a right to have such files destroyed.

Related to this matter, and another subject of these hearings, is the impending resumption by the intelligence agencies of their programs of destruction of documents. We are frankly concerned that before Congress can act on H.R. 169 and H.R. 12039—the bills before us which would require notification—the agencies may dispose of the evidence of past wrongdoing. Several agencies have indicated their strong desire to resume destruction of documents now that the Pike and Church Committees have reported. We have asked them to desist, at least until Congress can act on this or similar legislation to notify the victims of improper activities.

It is now common knowledge that the FBI and CIA, among other agencies, have in the past three decades engaged in many improper or illegal interferences with the rights of innocent individuals who were merely exercising the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution. These invasions took several forms, from illegal mail openings and burglaries to elaborate programs of harassment and disruption such as the Special Service Section of Internal Revenue

and the FBI's COINTELPRO, to the monitoring of international cable traffic, to extensive programs of data collection and dissemination such as the CIA's CHAOS program.

The bills to be considered today would require that *every* person and organization who is named in an index or the subject of a file concerning any of these programs and certain other activities such as illegal wiretaps, mail opening or break-ins—that *every* such person or organization be informed that there is a file or reference to him or her, that he or she has certain rights under the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act, and that he or she has a right to have expunged such files or references which violate the Privacy Act. I stress "every" because it appears to me that the program of notification to the victims of COINTELPRO recently announced by Attorney General Levi is far too narrow in scope and purpose. I hope the Justice Department witnesses here today will address themselves to this concern and to the other concerns which have been expressed regarding their very limited notice program.

Before discussing the nature and extent of the programs and activities which fall under H.R. 169 and H.R. 12039, I want to make clear that we do not view these bills as finished legislation. The purposes of hearings such as this one is to ascertain whether legislation should be amended. It may be necessary, for example, to expand the programs and activities covered by the bills to include forms of harassment and interference with individual rights not covered by arbitrary program designations such as "COINTELPRO" or "CHAOS." For example, the CIA's CHAOS program, which we will discuss shortly with CIA Director Bush, did not include all CIA programs directed against domestic organizations and individuals. In addition to CHAOS, the CIA conducted a program monitoring dissent on U.S. campuses, and infiltrated organizations in the Washington, D.C. area such as the Women's Strike for Peace, the Washington Peace Center, CORE, the American Humanist Society and the Washington Ethical Society. I see no reason why the objects of these programs or incidents of surveillance should not be given notice as well as the victims of CHAOS. In the FBI area, the notorious FBI program of harassment of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. was not considered to be part of COINTELPRO. Also, FBI programs directed against such targets as certain American Indian groups, certain peace groups and organizations such as the Institute for Policy Studies were not technically COINTELPRO, yet the victims of these activities deserve to be given notice of improper investigations and harassment. In addition, certain forms of intensive investigation, pretext contracts, the use of the grand jury to harass and other forms of surveillance may be proper subjects of the bills before us.

Our concern here, by the way, is not to interfere with any legitimate law enforcement or foreign intelligence activity of the agencies, but solely to require that the domestic subjects of unlawful programs and activities be notified and be informed of their rights under the law.

Before hearing from our witnesses I want to set forth a brief outline of the activities and programs covered by the bills before us. They would require notice to all who were subjected to the following activities:

Mail openings. For over twenty years, the CIA engaged in a massive program of clearly illegal mail openings. Literally millions of envelopes were photographed or copied and the contents of 215,820 letters were read and distributed to units within CIA and to other agencies such as the FBI. Although various CIA and FBI watch lists were utilized, mail openings were not confined to those on the lists. Many innocent people, myself included, were subjected to this invasion of privacy when they had neither committed nor were suspected of committing any crime. We would require that all those whose mail was opened be given notice of that fact and an opportunity to obtain their files.

Burglaries. As far as I can determine, the Congress has never been fully apprised of the extent of illegal burglaries, or "black bag jobs", committed by the intelligence agencies against domestic targets. In fact, recent events make it clear that even the Department of Justice may not be aware of the extent of these activities. In a civil case involving 92 burglaries of the offices of the Socialist Workers Party in New York City, the FBI is said to have withheld disclosure of the number of, and responsibility for these burglaries from the Justice Department lawyers defending the case. At least, that is what the Justice Department lawyers claim. While we may not know the exact number of these illegal entries, we do know that both CIA and FBI has engaged in illegal burglaries in violation of the Fourth Amendment.

Warrantless Surveillance. The Supreme Court has held that warrantless surveillance is unconstitutional where the object of the surveillance is not a foreign power or its agent. We now know that the FBI has conducted a large number of wiretaps where the object of the tap was not a foreign power or its agents. In fact, the objects of the famous "Kissinger taps" were restricted to newsmen and former employees of the National Security Council. Again, we would require that all those who were subjected to nonconsensual, warrantless wiretaps be given notice.

Monitoring of International Communications. This Subcommittee has recently heard testimony about how the domestic cable companies have been cooperating with the FBI and the National Security Agency for almost 30 years in monitoring all cable traffic between this country and abroad. Again, a large net was used to gather everything, whether involving a proper object of scrutiny or your grandmother's letter containing family gossip.

The bills before us also cover three major programs—CIA's CHAOS, FBI's COINTELPRO and the Special Service Section of Internal Revenue.

CHAOS. This CIA program, which began as a survey of the extent of any foreign connections with domestic dissident events, evolved into a massive collection of data on American citizens and organizations. The Rockefeller Report found that "The names of all persons mentioned in intelligence source reports received by Operation CHAOS were computer-indexed. . . . Eventually, approximately 300,000 names of American citizens and organizations were thus stored in the CHAOS computer system." CHAOS also maintained files on nearly 1,000 organizations, including such "dangerous" elements as the "Women's Liberation Movement," "Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam," the "National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam" and the "Women's Strike for Peace." The Rockefeller Report suggests that these files be destroyed. I agree, but not before the subjects of the file are made aware of the way their government spied on them.

COINTELPRO. From 1956 to 1971, when it is claimed the program terminated, the FBI engaged in a "Counterintelligence Program" targeted against at least five domestic groups. These targets named by the FBI as "white hate groups" and "black hate groups" and the new left, among others, were not necessarily "hate" groups. An organization such as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (one of the "black hate groups") should not be included under the rubric given it by the FBI, and there are other examples of the FBI designating a domestic dissident organization as a "hate" group and target of disruption when it was nothing more than a dissident organization. The purpose of the programs against these groups were harassment, interference and intimidation. The tactics used included dissemination of anonymous and false information, establishing sham organizations for disruptive purposes, interfering with political and economic relationships, and a variety of shocking activities against innocent Americans.

The Attorney General recently announced a very limited program of notifying victims of COINTELPRO, and we will want to discuss that program with the Justice Department witnesses here today. My initial impression is that the Justice Department program does not nearly go far enough. I am informed that only a few hundred of the thousands of people and organizations who were harassed by the FBI will be given notice and then the notice to be given hardly suffices to give the victim sufficient information about his or her rights under law.

The Special Service Section of Internal Revenue. This unit focused on "ideological, militant, subversive, radical, and similar type organizations." By 1973, there was a total of 11,458 SSS files on individuals and organizations. These files were often opened at the instigation of the FBI, information from tax returns was supplied to the FBI, and the program was undoubtedly used for harassing tax audits. We will inquire into this subject in detail when IRS Commissioner Alexander appears before this Subcommittee on May 11.

The principal bill before us, H.R. 12039, would amend the Privacy Act of 1976 to require that the subjects of every one of the programs listed here and the persons against whom the tactics in question were employed would be notified and given the right to expunge their files.

The Privacy Act presently requires that no Federal agency may maintain files on individuals which are not accurate, relevant, timely and complete. Also, no agency may maintain records describing how any individual exercises First Amendment rights. These were the provisions of the Act recently utilized in the expungement of the content of the taps and surveillance conducted against the Columnist Joseph Kraft. But thousands of other Americans are the subjects of improperly gathered materials about which they are unaware. The bills under consideration here would provide that notice and would make clear that the individual has the right to have improper records expunged.

It should be noted that the Rockefeller Commission recommended that certain improperly gathered files, such as the CHAOS files, be destroyed, and other agencies are anxious to destroy records which should not have been collected in the first place. It might therefore be asked: What is the purpose of these bills?

Why not just let us get rid of these files and be done with the past? The answer is that we are condemned to repeat the past unless we can learn from it. It is necessary, though perhaps uncomfortable, for us to learn the full extent of the wrongs done to innocent people in the name of government if our democracy is to survive and flourish. If we are not to repeat the horrors of the past three decades we must study and learn how and why we did what we did. It is for this reason that I insist that we not bury the wrongs with the wrongdoers, but that we all understand what happened so as not to repeat it in the future.

This hearing and subsequent hearings will attempt to ascertain the extent and nature

of the files maintained by the various intelligence agencies on the subjects of our bills. We will attempt to trace the dissemination throughout the government of certain of these records. It is important to remember that during this period, the traditional lines of jurisdiction between agencies regarding surveillance records became almost meaningless. The files are interwoven; they fed upon each other. Exchanges, watch lists, and wide-spread dissemination make it extremely difficult to purge the files without meticulous tracing. What purpose is served, for example, to destroy the CIA's CHAOS files, if they are replicated in FBI files and in other CIA records?

The bill also eliminates the specific exemption the Privacy Act presently gives the Secret Service and the CIA. When the Privacy Act was passed, I opposed these exemptions on the ground that there were sufficient exemption categories for specific types of records and that no case has been made to exempt an agency such as the CIA from every access provision of the law. There is no such blanket exemption for a particular agency under the Freedom of Information Act and I see no need for one under the Privacy Act.

FOREST MANAGEMENT—1960 TO 1976

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1976

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the issue of forest management is raised frequently these days as mark-up on major forestry legislation continues in the Senate Committees on Agriculture and Interior, and is soon to start in the House Agriculture Committee. Though the subject and its many interesting complexities is new to many of us, the same problems of clarifying multiple use, maturity, allowable cut, even-aged and mixed-aged management, clearcutting, sustained yield and the like have been discussed and debate for many years.

It seems, when reading the remarks and records of the 1960 debate over the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act, that little has been accomplished in 16 years. Our goals of protecting wildlife, watersheds, and soil quality, while preserving land for timber production, range, wilderness, and recreation seem almost as remote as they were two decades ago.

An excellent statement which serves as a reminder of this lack of progress is that made by Richard McArdle, then Chief of the Forest Service, in 1960 at the Fifth World Forestry Congress. He mentions that the Fourth World Forestry Congress (1954) "implicitly recognized by accepting the principle of 'multiple use' of the forest—that—specialization—in some cases)—would certainly not help toward reaching the desired goal of deriving the maximum yield from the land for the benefit of the community as a whole."

Here we are today, still trying to preserve and enforce the term "multiple use." I do believe it is time for the laws to be strengthened, the guidelines clarified. Othewise, in another 5 or 10 years we will be standing here, debating the need for stronger guidelines to safeguard multiple uses and wondering why our national forests cannot adequately regenerate to produce our needed timber supply. Our national forest resource base continues to be sorely beleaguered while we ponder the wisdom of restrictions on timber management abuses.

I include the statement of Mr. McArdle in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to read it for it will quickly point out the issues that after all these years continue to remain so pressingly before us:

THE CONCEPT OF MULTIPLE USE OF FOREST AND ASSOCIATED LANDS—ITS VALUES AND LIMITATIONS

(By Richard E. McArdle)

It is a great honor to address this first general session of the Fifth World Forestry Congress. My subject is the same as the theme of the Congress—the multiple use of forest lands. This theme is an appropriate sequel to the Fourth World Forestry Congress at Dehra Dun in 1954. There the theme was the role of forested areas in the land economy and economic development of a country.

In reporting on the Fourth World Forestry Congress, the FAO said: "There are few countries in which production in the forest is limited to timber alone. It is in fact by no means certain that specialized single-purpose land use, particularly on a permanent basis, is ideal. In some social and economic environments, such specialization would certainly not help towards reaching the desired goal of deriving the maximum yield from the land for the benefit of the community as a whole. This the Congress implicitly recognized by accepting the principle of 'multiple use' of the forest."

"Multiple use" is a familiar term to foresters of the United States. Its meaning was symbolized on this stage in the opening pageant yesterday. Pictured were the five major uses of forest land—for wood production, use as watersheds, grazing by domestic livestock, the forest as habitat for wild game and fish, and use of the forest for outdoor recreation.

Although "multiple use" may not be a customary term everywhere, the practice of multiple use has been long established in some intensively managed forests of other countries. Later in this Congress you will hear papers reviewing multiple use here and in other countries and in various kinds of ownerships. Some of the Congress tours will enable you to observe the practice of multiple use on forest lands in the United States.

As FAO noted, management of land to serve as many uses as possible is everywhere becoming more essential. When there is abundance of natural resources and few people, there is little need for multiple-purpose land use. But when increasingly large numbers of people must rely on an unchanging or diminishing resource base, they must make the most effective use of the resources they have. Multiple use of renewable land resources thus is a necessity born of scarcity of resources and abundance of people who need these resources.

Competition for the use of land is growing throughout the world. This competition will not decrease but will increase as world populations increase. World population is now about 3 billion persons. It has increased as much in the last two decades as was the total growth of population up to the year 1750. In 1800 my own country had 5 million people. One hundred years later we had 76 million. In the next 50 years our population doubled. The census now being made in the United States indicates an increase in our population from 5 million to 180 million people in 160 years. And U.S. population is expected to nearly double again by the end of this century.

It will not surprise you who come from older countries to hear that in the U.S.A. we are now feeling the impact of a dynamic population growth on a static land base. Older countries already have had this experience. A few countries represented here today still have abundant natural resources, more than adequate for their present populations. Inevitably, however, as their populations increase, their need for resources will increase, and competition for the use of land in those countries will become more intense.

As the people of the world become city dwellers, they tend to lose sight of their dependence on natural resources. Most of these are products of the land. My forefathers and yours lived close to the land. They knew their dependence on the land for food, for clothing, for shelter, and for fuel to warm the shelter.

To these basic necessities of life we must add today our dependence on natural resources for all the raw materials of industry. The history of mankind is the history of man's competition for land, of man's struggle to obtain adequate natural resources—and of man's overutilization of resources.

I realize that these are facts well known to this audience. Foresters are trained to take a long look ahead. We also are required to live close to the land. Thus we understand the dependence of people on natural resources produced by the land. We are aware, too, that our stewardship of a large part of the earth's surface imposes upon us great responsibility to obtain full productivity of these lands for the benefit of our fellow man, whom we serve. This is why we, the foresters of many nations, propose to dedicate our discussions at this Congress to sharing our knowledge and experience so that we may improve policies and practices relating to wise use of forest lands.

The wise use of forest lands, however, cannot be considered in a vacuum. It must be considered in relationship to the fullest possible yield of all the products and services that forest land provides for people.

In past years many of us have thought that we had enough land in forest in the USA to meet all foreseeable needs for wood and other products and services of forest lands. Today we are not so sure. We think our earlier estimates were too conservative. We are now genuinely concerned. Much forest land is being taken for other uses. Competition for land is becoming intense in the United States.

For example, wherever you may travel in this country you will see great expansion of urban areas. This is taking land which heretofore was included in our estimates of available forest area.

Superhighways, new airports, transmission lines for electrical power, oil, and natural gas, and construction of dams and reservoirs are taking many millions of acres of forest land. Forest land will continue to be taken for national defense purposes.

Large pressures are developing to set aside additional forest lands exclusively for recreational use. Conversion of land from forest to food production, inevitable in the next few decades, will include substantial portions of our most productive forest land.

The diversion of forest lands to other purposes could, in another 40 years, total about one-fourth of the present U.S. commercial forest land area, equivalent to one-third of our timber-growing capacity.

I do not condemn single use, primary use, one-purpose use, or exclusive use of land for one major purpose by whatever name may be applied. Some of these individual uses are as essential for the benefit of people as is the use of forest land for multiple purposes.

For some purposes, superhighways, for example, the land obviously must be devoted exclusively to that use. There is nothing we can do to make such land serve more than that one purpose.

The consequences, however, of large-scale diversion of forest land to single-use purposes are now so serious in the United States as to justify careful consideration. Every acre of forest land diverted to nonforest use adds to the lands remaining in forest an additional burden of productivity. By the end of this century, a short 40 years away, need for wood in the U.S. will be double our requirements today. We will be hard-pressed to meet future wood requirements even if no more of our present forest land is diverted to other uses.

In addition to meeting greatly expanded requirements for wood production, forest land management in the United States faces greatly increased demands for the other products and services which forests provide. For example, exclusive of Alaska, more than one-half of all the water of the Western United States originates on the national forests, although these publicly owned forests comprise only one-fifth of the total area in this part of our country. Maintenance of adequate forest cover on this land protects water quality. Protection alone, however, will not produce the large increases in quantity of water needed by greatly increased numbers of people, by agriculture, and by industry. These requirements have doubled in the last 20 years and are expected to double again in another 18. To increase water yield, manipulation of the forest cover is essential. If your tours take you to some of our experimental forests, you will see how the methods used in timber harvesting can serve also to increase water yield.

Many coniferous U.S. forests and intermingled grasslands are used for grazing of domestic livestock. In this country, as in yours, forests also provide the habitat for many kinds of wild game. These uses are increasing.

Recreational use of national forests has tripled in the past 12 years.

Use of forest land for these several purposes is nothing new. In every country and for centuries, forest land has been so used.

What is new is the rapidly growing awareness of the need to apply multiple-use management more widely and more intensively. This comes not only from the obvious need to make forest lands more fully useful to the people but also to lessen the pressures to divert forest lands from a combination of uses to some one exclusive use. In most instances forest land is not fully serving the people if used exclusively for a purpose which could also be achieved in combination with several other uses.

Multiple use of forest lands in the United States did not spring into full flower overnight. While the term has become commonplace only in the last two decades, the practice of multiple use in the United States goes back to the origin of the national forests more than half a century ago. National-forest policies from the very first have emphasized resource use. The first Forest Service manual, significantly termed the "Use Book," recognized a multiplicity of uses. Even before this, the Forest Service had been instructed by the Secretary of Agriculture that national-forest land was to be devoted to its most productive use for the permanent good of the whole people, that all of the resources were for use, and that decisions would always be made from the standpoint of the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run. These instructions have constituted Forest Service doctrine from the beginning. They are the genesis of multiple use.

Full recognition of the multiple-use principle of land management was given by the Congress of the United States about two months ago. The Act of June 12, 1960, directs that the renewable resources of the federally owned national forests, some 181 million acres, shall be managed for sustained yield and multiple use. General legislative authority to manage these public properties for use of their watershed, timber, forage, outdoor recreation, and wildlife and fish resources was provided many years ago. The significance of the recent legislative enactment is, first, legislative recognition of multiple-use and sustained-yield principles of management; second, a clear-cut directive to apply these principles on the national forests and third, naming the basic renewable resources for which the national forests are established and administered and assuring them equal priority under law.

Although this law applies to only one class of publicly owned lands, the principles involved have wider application. On the federally owned national forests, the objective is to meet the needs of all the people. On State lands the objective would be to best meet the needs of the citizens of that State. On privately owned lands, the objective would be to best meet the needs of the owner. He would express those needs in whatever terms he might choose. These private-owner criteria usually tend to be economic ones.

The act spells out definitions of multiple use and sustained yield as these principles are to be applied to the national forests. Since the general objective is to manage these lands so that they best meet the needs of the American people, the act and the accompanying legislative reports require that the five basic renewable resources shall be utilized in the combination that will best serve the people. Emphasis is on utilization, not preservation.

The legislative definition requires that management decisions are to be based on the relative values of the various resources and not necessarily upon economic factors only. Intangible values which are difficult to express accurately in monetary terms also are to be considered. The definition does not require maximum production for all resources for any one resource.

The legislative history of this act directs that in making application of the principle of multiple use to a specific area, equal consideration is to be given all of the various renewable resource uses, but this does not mean using every acre for all of the various uses. Some areas will be managed for less than all uses, but multiple-use management requires that there be more than two uses.

An essential of multiple use is positive, affirmative management of the several uses involved. Haphazard occurrence of these uses on some particular tract of land does not constitute multiple-use management. Multiple use is not a passive practice. On the contrary, it is the deliberate and carefully planned integration of various uses so as to interfere with each other as little as possible and to supplement each other as much as possible. Multiple use is by no means an assemblage of single uses. It requires conscious, coordinated management of the various renewable resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land.

Multiple use must be over a period long enough to experience the cycle of the seasons; that is, a year or more. It does not require that all uses involved must be practiced simultaneously at the same instant.

Size of area is a key factor in multiple-use management. Application must be to areas large enough to give sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions. On the national forests we normally think in terms of our smallest administrative units, which at present average about 200,000 acres. On large private holdings similar acreage might be applicable, but for small private ownerships the unit areas would, of course, be much smaller. They might be as small as 40 acres.

Multiple-use management of the renewable surface resources obviously requires control of all uses on the same land by one authority. Such management is not possible if several coordinate authorities are each trying to direct different uses on the same land. Central decision making is a prerequisite.

In brief, multiple-use management as we practice it on the national forests requires us to consider all of the five basic renewable resources, although on any specific area we may not have all of them in operation at any one time. It obliges us to coordinate these various uses even though doing this results in less than fullest possible productivity of some uses. The requirement for sustained yield applies to all renewable rsources and is aimed both at getting a high level of productivity and at preventing overuse of any resource or impairment of productivity of the land.

Multiple use is not a panacea. It has limitations, but it also has overriding advantages. I am convinced of the distinct advantages of applying multiple-use management to the great bulk of our forest land.

First of all, multiple use helps to overcome problems of scarcity. It tends to reduce or resolve conflicts of interest and competition for resources. It promotes balance in resource use. It impedes the ascendancy of single-interest pressures. Properly applied, multiple use involves consideration of both esthetic and economic criteria in arriving at management decisions. It offers balance between materialistic and nonmaterialistic values.

Multiple use properly understood and properly applied is now, and will continue to be, the best management for most of the publicly owned forest lands of the United States. It will gradually become the best management for many of the large private holdings. It will always have less applicability to smaller private properties, but many of these owners will in time find it to their own best interest to practice some degree of multiple use.

Finally, the overwhelming advantage of multiple use is that through it foresters can make forest lands contribute their utmost to society. The basic purpose of forest conservation is a social one—to satisfy the intangible as well as the materialistic needs of people. In this way, I believe foresters can make a major contribution to human betterment and perhaps even to world peace.

And now a closing word to you as eminent leaders in a respected profession. Multiple-use forest management is a challenge to foresters to broaden their vision. We must be forest land managers instead of primarily timber growers. The thinking of foresters is believed to be preoccupied with timber and dominated by silviculture. To some extent this criticism is justified. But multiple use, when properly applied, eliminates this bias. The future success of foresters and the contribution of the forestry profession to the welfare of our countries may depend on our response to the need for a balanced use of forest land resources. May we now and always perform in the best interests of the countries we serve.

CONGRESSMAN KEMP SALUTES THE ISRAEL EXPO '76—GALA CELEBRATION IN BUFFALO, N.Y.

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1976

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the United States Jewish Federation of Buffalo under the auspices the women's division is